

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the Examiner's rejection of the above-identified application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks. Claims 1-4 and 8-15 are in the application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 4 and 8-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over GB 2,334,347 in view of Brogger et al and further in view of Ridinger and Stevens. Claim 3 was rejected over the references of claim 1 and further in view of Mead et al. Claim 13 is rejected over the references of claim 1 and further in view of Wamprecht et al. Claims 14-15 are rejected over the references of claim 1 and further in view of Gee et al. Applicant respectfully traverses.

GB 2334347 relates to a process that uses UV radiation through a mask to expose small circular sections of a photo resist layer, to cross link the polymer so that it will not dissolve in further processing. Non exposed regions dissolve, leaving the circular sections present which can be used to form a code when used with a suitable reader. Brogger discloses making markings on a sheet, which is then ground down, leaving particles of many different sizes. Only some of these particles contain the required markings. Brogger does not disclose laser cutting of the particles. Neither Stevens nor Ridinger disclose a process where particles are laser etched with digits and then

laser cut to form precise microparticles. In fact, none of the references, either alone or in combination, teach or suggest the process by which precisely marked microparticles may be created by laser etching the sheet and cutting the sheet precisely so that the smallest microparticles containing the entire marking are obtained. This is a vast improvement over the prior processes, because it enables the use of the smallest possible microparticles, each with a precise marking. Each particle can be cut precisely so that it can contain the entire marking, but does not require any extra material. Even combining the references would not lead to this result, because GB 2334347 does not teach precisely laser cutting around an applied marking such as claimed in claim 1.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1-4 and 8-15 are patentable over the cited references, taken either singly or in combination. Early allowance of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,  
MICHAEL CLEARY - 1



COLLARD & ROE, P.C.

1077 Northern Boulevard

Roslyn, New York 11576

(516) 365-9802

ECR/ecr/

Allison C. Collard, Reg.No.22,532

Edward R. Freedman, Reg.No.26,048

Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg.No.29,298


Elizabeth Collard Richter, Reg.No.35,103

Attorneys for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

Fax No. 703-872-9306

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being sent by facsimile-transmission to the Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 20, 2004.

  
Elizabeth Collard Richter

R:\Patents\COLLARDY-1\Amendments\Final OA.wpd